

## U.N. VIOLATES OWN LAW IN RHODESIA INTERVENTION

(Continued from Page 1)

possessed the responsibility for voting. The Declaration of Rights and the Constitution Council detailed rights and freedoms for all individuals, without regard to race, tribe, origin, political opinion or color; to life, liberty, security of person, enjoyment of property, and protection of the law, freedom of conscience, expression, assembly and association, and respect for private and family life.

### Membership of Parliament

The subsequent 1965 Constitution retains all of the above Declaration of Rights and safeguards. In 1961 as now, Africans, Asians, Coloured and Europeans had equal rights to franchise and seats in Parliament. The vote and all sixty-five seats in Parliament were available to all, strictly on merit. At present fourteen non-white members occupy House seats. Technically, every seat could be contested by Africans. The law provides minimal standards to which all voters, regardless of color must conform, standards imposed solely that, in a country whose population ranges all the way from the most primitive to the most sophisticated, voters will comprise only those responsible people who appreciate the meaning and significance of a vote.

The following statement by the African chiefs to the British Government in 1964 echoes the sentiments of most black Rhodesians: "We would press for immediate independence for Southern Rhodesia in the terms of the existing Constitution which allows for involvement and forward development. We have seen events that have already taken place in other countries."

### The Real Issue

Rhodesia has an indisputable record of accomplishment, unmatched on the continent and has reached an outstanding political and economic maturity. It is a successful and thriving country that has beaten back disease, quelled racial fires, enhanced the status of Africans and maintained peace — all carved out of a wilderness.

### British Perfidy

Rhodesia was hard-core private enterprise, hard-core anti-communist and hard-core pro-Christian. This was too much for the Socialist Revolutionary Marxist leaders of Great Britain. This is a typical example of Communist chicanery which makes the racial issue the focal point. The real issue is carefully hidden: private enterprise and Christianity, on the one hand — Marxian Socialism and attendant revolution on the other.

Britain's behavior toward Rhodesia has been unjust, unfair and totally immoral. The Prime Minister would malign a gallant nation for whom his Government had nothing but praise less than twenty-five years ago. Step by step Rhodesia was repulsed. Britain torpedoed the Federation of Southern Rhodesia to give independence to Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. No such reward was handed to Southern Rhodesia despite her thirty-year record of self-government. The 1961 Constitution was regarded by all Rhodesians as a guarantee of her future independence. By it, Britain surrendered the reserve powers she had held, and could never again interfere in the former's affairs. Rhodesia had been granted "Independence within the federal framework." The Federation's disintegration did not change her de facto status of independence.

### Showdown Imminent

The Prime Minister and the British Government ignored all arguments in favor of Rhodesia. In the year 1965 British hostility increased and as Britain looked more and more with favor upon the revolutionary elements, conditions worsened for Rhodesia, pressure mounted from within, and a showdown had to be forced on the long-awaited question of her full independence.

At first, Wilson pretended an honest interest in an equitable solution of the problem. In October, 1965, Ian Smith went to London. British insincerity was soon apparent. Of the five mandatory points, Rhodesia yielded on all save one, and that she was endeavoring to bring about as soon as feasible. Wilson presented Rhodesia with an impossible ultimatum: total and immediate African rule, or no independence. Mr. Wilson had stated in 1964:

"The Labor Government is totally opposed to granting independence to Southern Rhodesia so long as the government of that country remains under the control of the white minority."

Britain would not budge. For Rhodesia to yield would mean reverting back to savagery and barbarism, wiping out years of progress, and putting all white lives in danger. Ian Smith had been crucified on the cross of diplomatic expediency. British tyranny had triumphed once again.

Of course we know perfectly well there is no more British Government today than there is an American Government. But there is a Zionist Invisible Government controlling Britain and America and all major nations through the Zionist-controlled United Nations.


An analogy will serve to point up the preposterous character of the ultimatum given Ian Smith. Let us recall the year 1776 and our own memorable Revolution. We rebelled against tyrannical "Taxation without representation." But just suppose that George III had laid down an ultimatum that the colonies must turn over their government to immediate rule by the majority (Indians)! The outrage of the colonies would be beyond comprehension. For all practical purposes, this is the ultimatum Rhodesia faces. To further humiliate and degrade Rhodesia, Britain, in an almost unprecedented act of diplomatic piracy, stole Rhodesia's hard-earned foreign assets, and charged her with default in her international obligations.

During the coming weeks there will be much discussion in Congress on the burning Rhodesian question. Many lawmakers are incensed at L.B.J.'s Executive Order ordering sanctions against Rhodesia. Congressman James B. Utt of California has introduced a bill calling for the U.S. withdrawal from the U.N. embargo. The bill not only cites the U.N. Charter as justification, but also Article I, Section 8 of U.S. Constitution which bestows on Congress alone the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. Utt had a very interesting observation on this matter:

"How can we join such actions against Rhodesia without at once requesting England, and all 'friendly nations' in the U.N., to extend sanctions against North Vietnam? The United States is not at war with Rhodesia. We are fighting North Vietnam. We are losing 200 American lives a day in those jungles. England is supplying our enemy with war materials while using the Rhodesian embargo to increase its own supply of raw materials."

Let's all get into the fight for justice for Rhodesia, upon which the fate of all Southwest Africa may well depend. Should Rhodesia emerge strong victorious, an imminent World War III threat may be averted. Write Cong. Utt for a copy of his joint Resolution which would instruct the Federal Government to notify the United Nations that the United States will not honor U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia. The Resolution would also nullify Executive Order No. 11322, issued by the President on Jan. 5, 1967, which orders observance of the sanctions. Write your Congressmen and urge them to support Cong. Utt's bill. Ask your friends and neighbors to do the same. This is indeed 1776 all over again. Alert your friends and neighbors!

**South Africa has outlawed the Communist Party and barred Communists from exercising any influence in government, industry or labor. Another reason the United Nations must get a war going in South Africa.**



## ARTHUR GOLDBERG

Ambassador Plenipotentiary



MAN OF MANY FACES

Arthur Goldberg, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N., is a key official of the ZIONIST INVISIBLE GOVERNMENT, a dedicated Marxist, and one of the world's most brazen exponents of treason. There had to be a reason the Zionists moved their man from the higher Supreme Court rank to the lower U.N. Ambassador category. LBJ, their errand boy, dared not interfere. The explanation may be found in Goldberg's rank. HE HAS THE HIGHEST DIPLOMATIC RANK — AMBASSADOR PLENIPOTENTIARY — and the power rests with this Zionist to send our boys to war, with or without the consent of Congress.

There is no doubt a direct connection between a country's foreign policy ventures and the characteristics of its leading diplomats. Let us examine one such personage: Arthur Goldberg. As Goldberg passes from one contradiction to another, his utterances, semantics and official statements have fallen into a puzzling pattern of stratagems and cunning. For example: the Vietnam War. The most obdurate adherent of State Department and U.N. policy, would maintain, at least when the chips are down, that we honestly intended to win. But Goldberg offered this astounding process of reasoning in a London address on March 3, 1966:

"My view is that America is not fighting to win a war. We are fighting to give application to an old Greek proverb which is that the purpose of war is not to annihilate an enemy but to get him to mend his ways."

The enemy who should mend its ways has already killed nearly 10,000 American boys in Vietnam alone, and operates only by MINORITY rule.

On the other hand, Goldberg has not yielded an iota in his firm endorsement of the illegitimate state of Israel, which triumphed in the wake of acts of aggression infringing upon moral and international law, another example of MINORITY rule. The same is true of RED CHINA. The Ambassador Plenipotentiary has never officially condemned RED CHINA and many believe he is the behind-the-scenes ringmaster in the three-ring circus, reaching deep into his bag of stratagems to come up with the proper maneuver that will ease her into the U.N.

NOW WE COME TO RHODESIA: Anti-Communist, pro-American, unique model of racial harmony. Gone is Goldberg's concern about the Greek proverb and his almost "Christian" anxiety about getting the enemy to "mend his ways." Only two days after the Rhodesian declaration of Independence, Nov. 13, 1965, Goldberg told the General Assembly that "Rhodesians no longer have any diplomatic status in the U.S.; that the government is putting an embargo on shipments to Rhodesia and is cancelling the sugar quota of Rhodesia."

SO IT ALL DEPENDS ON WHETHER YOU ARE CHRISTIAN OR COMMUNIST.

This arrogant Zionist, with a most notorious red record, not content with alienating the Arabs, is out to alienate the entire world, and doing a good job of it. With "friends" like Goldberg we don't need any enemies. When will an aroused America demand the recall of this absurd appointment?